DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 912 CG 004 009

By-Haake, Bernard F.; Langworthy, Philip B.

Student Activism in the High Schools of New York State.

State Univ. of New York, Albany. State Educational Dept.
Pub Date Mar 69
Note-23p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.25
Descriptors-*Activism, *High Schools, *High School Students, Secondary Schools, Secondary School Students, *Student Alienation, *Student Attitudes, Student Behavior, Student School Relationship

The purpose of nine regional meetings between New York State Education Department personnel, educators and students from selected secondary school districts was to obtain information about unrest and the changing expectations of high school students. The following conclusions were made: (1) rising expectations of students are part of the "times," (2) changing expectations are not exclusively a racial matter, (3) a thread of commonality exists in all student unrest, (4) outside organizations somewhat encourage student activism, (5) rigidity of the educational environment contributes to student unrest, (6) student expectations of their own governance are basically rooted in altruism and integrity, (7) rising expectations for all students should be encouraged, (8) students involved in activism have diverse motives, necessitating differentiated responses, and (9) student activism will increase, assuming a variety of forms. It was recommended that educators be attuned to the rising expectations of students in initiating improvements in the secondary school system. (Author/LS)

ED030912

The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

March 1969

A
MEMORANDUM

TO: Walter Crewson, Associate Commissioner for Elementary, Secondary and Continuing Education

FROM: Bernard F. Haake, Assistant Commissioner for Instructional Services
Philip B. Langworthy, Assistant Commissioner for Pupil Personnel Services and Continuing Education

SUBJECT: STUDENT ACTIVISM IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS OF NEW YORK STATE

A report to the New York State Commissioner of Education regarding a series of regional meetings with students, teachers, and administrators conducted to discuss student activism in the high schools of New York State.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"If the establishment got any message out of the disturbance, it certainly should include the fact that a different type of education is going to have to be forged for all youths...not just the minority."*

*High School Racial Confrontation. A Study of the White Plains, New York Student Boycott, White Plains Board of Education, February 4, 1969, P. 57

004003

A REPORT OF
REGIONAL MEETINGS OF STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL
WITH EDUCATORS AND STUDENTS FROM SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS
(September 1968 - January 1969)

Statement of Purpose

1. To secure advice and counsel from students and educators in the field with reference to changing expectations of students concerning their own governance

2. To share with students and educators of local school districts the insights gained from actions taken by other school districts which have experimented with new student-teacher-administrator relationships

How did this project come into being?

It is perhaps fitting to note that the genesis of this project was a suggestion made by a chief school officer during a June 1968 meeting of the Commissioner's Advisory Committee chaired in this instance by Associate Commissioner Walter Crewson.

Fitting in the sense that Associate Commissioner Crewson has long espoused the cause of greater student participation in the affairs of schools and fitting in the sense that the Commissioner's Advisory Committee, a selected group of school administrators selected on a statewide basis and convened periodically each year, has as its raison d'etre the function of counseling with the New York State Education Commissioner regarding the conduct of education throughout the reaches of the State.

During the spring of 1968, student unrest on college campuses was receiving considerable coverage in the nation's press and isolated instances of such incidents at the high school level had been reported in New York State and elsewhere in the country. Because the pressure of overt student unrest and the unique forms in which it surfaced were relatively new phenomena for school administrators, it was suggested by a member of the Commissioner's Advisory Committee that the State Education Department should undertake to examine the matter and consider what its position should be and what action it should take in the event that the prophesied "spread to the high schools" did in fact take place.

The suggestion was later reviewed with Commissioner James E. Allen, Jr. who endorsed the merit of the suggestion and directed Associate Commissioner Crewson to involve staff personnel in preparing recommendations for dealing with student activism at the high school level and formulating suggestions regarding the responsibility of the State Education Department with reference to the situation.

What happened next?

Upon conferring with Assistant Commissioners for Pupil Personnel Services and Instructional Services, Associate Commissioner Crewson agreed that an examination of student unrest could not get at the realities of the problem unless students were involved. Accordingly a tentative plan was evolved for the convening of nine regional meetings of students with the two above-mentioned Assistant Commissioners.

The first of the regional meetings was held the very first week of school in September in Spring Valley, and was, in a sense, a "pilot run" which featured students from Rockland, Westchester, Dutchess, and Nassau Counties. A number of teachers were also invited plus several high school principals and superintendents of schools. Several of the students, teachers, and principals present had already been involved in confrontations. The "pilot run" was not only productive substantively, but it also served to alert the State Education Department representatives to the semantic and procedural sensitivities accompanying meetings dealing with student activism.

For example, it was pointed out unequivocally that any meeting described as concerning itself with "Law and Order in Our Schools" would automatically constitute an inhibition to free and open discussions because in some segments of society, adult and student, the terminology according to one participant "smacks of the white power structure." Another attendee substantiated the observation in stating, "It sounds like the establishment talking at us and that's part of the problem."

Teachers should be involved; administrators have a key role and should be consulted; invitations to regional meetings should come from a local source; representatives of students should be sought by inviting de facto as well as status leaders in the student power structure; urban, suburban, and rural

students should attend; meetings should be small in size; arrangements should be made to encourage students to speak freely without fear of censorship. These and many other important and valuable suggestions were outcomes of the Spring Valley meeting in addition to the matters of substance which will be dealt with elsewhere in this report.

At the September 1968 meeting of the Commissioner's Advisory Council the overall plan was reviewed with the chief school officers present and endorsement of the project was received. Thereupon, superintendents and/or Title III Regional Office Directors in selected areas of the State were asked to host regional meetings and invite students and a limited number of teachers and principals. Considerable emphasis was placed on the essentiality of convening a group of students representative of their region of the State to the extent that such was possible.

Nine regional meetings were held between September and December 1968 in Rockland County, in the Genesee Valley area, the Southern Tier, Eastern Long Island, Western Long Island, the Buffalo area, the Capital District, the Syracuse area, and in Westchester County. As might be expected, each meeting was different in format and content, attendance varied from 25 to slightly over a hundred, and the representativeness of the students varied from meeting to meeting. In general, however, it appeared as though the diversity characterizing students in New York State was ably represented.

It should be noted at this point that the series of regional meetings was supplemented by a January, 1969 meeting of the Commissioner's Advisory Council of Superintendents which featured, at the request of the superintendents, a spirited and lengthy discussion involving the New York State Commissioner of Education, approximately 40 high school students, and about 20 school superintendents. This meeting was held in the Regents Room of the State Education

Department building at Albany and members of the press were in attendance. Students and school superintendents from New York City, Schenectady, Rochester, and other areas interacted with their counterparts from various suburban and the rural upstate areas and with Commissioner Allen in a forthright and spirited fashion which left no doubt about the intensity and sincerity of their feelings and convictions.

Steps were also taken to secure the point of view of teachers, and the proferred assistance of the New York State Teachers Association resulted in a mid-January 1969 meeting at the State Education Department. Twelve teachers from Bennett High School in Buffalo, Newfane Central School, Rochester #4 School, Ithaca High School, Bethlehem Central High School, Syracuse Central Office, North Syracuse High School, Babylon High School, Bayport-Blue Point James Wilson Young High School, White Plains High School, Scarsdale High School, and Brighton High School met with Assistant Commissioners Haake and Langworthy and NYSTA Director of Research, Lois Wilson. The opinions voiced by the teachers were as candid and spirited as those expressed by students and were remarkably similar in substance.

Similar interest in the project was voiced by school administrators and as a result of cooperative action between the Council for Administrative Leadership (C.A.L.) and the State Education Department a survey of research and literature related to student unrest as well as a sampling of opinions of high school principals on the subject were obtained.

What did we hear at these meetings?

To attempt to do other than convey the essence, the mood, and tenor of the opinions expressed at the various meetings would be an impossible exercise. Opinions ranged from "Contemporary America is sick, doesn't work, throw it out and start over" to "The grown-ups know more about how to run things than we kids do, what can we possibly contribute?"

There were representatives of the extremists who had given up on the establishment, extremists who believe the only route to change is via the establishment, extremists who thought there was too much fuss about pupil participation "...which the kids really don't want anyway." There were students who cited newly evolved patterns of relationships which "...seemed to be working, right now, anyway," and students who "...never realized all this was going on. My friends would never think of disagreeing out loud with the principal!"

We heard about "the man"; "the greasies"; the closed-society nature of high schools resulting from grouping practices, from socio-economic status, from the presence of city ghettos and "white ghettos" caused by the lack of open housing in the suburbs. We heard about students who were regarded by themselves and by others as second class citizens. We heard about marking systems which convinced students by the end of elementary school that they didn't have it and wouldn't make it!

Dress codes, long hair, student newspapers, drugs, narcotics, and alcohol received their share of attention as did the oft-reported "communications failure." In this latter regard, an interesting insight was gained during some small group buzz sessions when one principal cited his excellent communications with his students while his students were reporting elsewhere how "out of touch" their principal was!

"Coke machines for the lunch room; students having a vote with teachers on curriculum committees; the idiocy of Regents exams which have nothing to do with what life is all about; students as voting members of boards of education; racism in the corridors, classrooms, and offices; teachers who like neither their jobs nor their students; Mickey Mouse Student Councils; finky school newspapers; Afro-American History; more black teachers and counselors;...schools, man, like nothing so kids turn on with pot; college prep kids are in, everybody else is out;

McLuhan, DuBois, Marcuse, Hanoi, Daley, Nixon" - these were the words and subjects we heard the students discuss.

Relevance is a big issue as are racism and the generation and credibility gaps. "Don't bury us with our parents' hang-ups" one boy from Rochester said, and his counterparts said the same thing in different ways in nearly every one of the nine regional meetings. "Nobody listens to us" was another oft repeated plea. "The teachers leave at 3:10, you can't even get to see the principal, and the guidance counselor spends all his time trying to get kids into college." "Parents just aren't with it - they don't understand. Or else they say, you decide. So who can you turn to except other kids?"

And then, too, albeit much less frequently, we would hear "Miss ....., she's something else. You can talk to her anytime about anything." In similar vein the recognition would be accorded that "Teachers are the answer. Some of them can make Shakespeare relevant and others make the Vietnam War seem like history, like nothing."

"My school is great," a black student from an inner city neighborhood said at the very end of a meeting, having taken that long to summon up his courage. "I don't know what kind of school the rest of you go to but they really care about kids in my school. You can get to see the principal anytime. He's helped a lotta guys."

You remember the boy who brilliantly and articulately argued for "the relevance of individualized learning which couldn't help but lead to greater self realization." You recall how he waited patiently to talk with you after the meeting. His cynical yet hopeful question at age sixteen, "Is anything really going to come of this?"

Poignant, too, was the young girl who, after a lively discussion about war, poverty, and discrimination, asked searchingly and directly, "When you were young, weren't you aware of these things; weren't you concerned at all?"

And on, and on, and on. How does one summarize days of conversation with hundreds of young people about matters which are very close to their hearts and minds? Subjectively probably. Short of having recorded, coded, and computer-analyzed every word that was spoken, a personalized reaction would seem to be in order, recognizing of course, that it carries with it the danger of over-simplification. What did we hear the students saying? I think we heard them say this: I am a human being. See me. Hear me. Please help me find out who I am. Help me to discover what life is all about. Soon.

What did the teachers and administrators say?

"I'll run my school and when the day comes that the kids take over, I'll quit," was in fact one response but so, too, was "It's a new ball game and you have to make up the rules as you go along. Parents, teachers, students all want a piece of the action!"

The administrators certainly represented a range of opinions and there were those who feared that societal permissiveness had encouraged students to try to take over "... and this would be disastrous." Equally fearful was the Superintendent who opined that far too many of his colleagues would react to student activism in a harsh, rigid, and repressive fashion which could only further damage relationships and create greater distance between administrators and students. Some principals reported working examples of techniques and reorganization which recognized that the force and energy of student activism could be channeled into productive and positive avenues leading to the improvement of curriculum, teaching, and learning.

One could sense developing between September and January, an increasing sensitivity on the part of administrators to the need for searching for new answers which would be relevant to the development of new relationships with the new style students filling their institutions. A poll of the nation's

school administrators reported in the September 1968 issue of Nation's Schools that 45% of the respondents expected student unrest to filter down to the high schools whereas 70% reported that they had not taken any action for coping with unrest if it did in fact develop!

Despite this reported national inertia, the administrators participating in the regional meetings seemed to be categorizeable, again subjectively, as follows: A small percentage had already anticipated the problem and were in the process of working constructively with the new drive on the part of students in behalf of participation; a sizeable percentage reflected heightened sensitivity to the new "ball game" and were searching for and considering approaches that might be applicable to their school situation; a lesser yet substantial percentage was watching and waiting; and a very small percentage would accept any form of participative management "over my dead body."

Now the teachers were something else again for the minutes taken at their meeting reveal, as you might expect, that they asked questions. Why is there student unrest? Why is there unrest in some areas and not in others? How can established institutions deal with student unrest? How can we build accountability into the redefined relationships between teachers, administrators, and students?

But they were critical too....of themselves. "Some of the unrest is the result of our teaching," one said, and another piggybacked with "We teach as though children were receptacles while they are pleading for better relationships with us."

"Perhaps many of us are too insecure and afraid of getting involved."

"Students can be involved in teacher evaluations but the faculty need to agree on this and it should be for the teacher and between teacher and student."

"Students want to learn, they also want to know the limits."

"Student expectations are changing. We can't cope with them unless we are willing to become involved in change ourselves."

"There is a need for greater communications between teachers, administrators, and students."

In summary, some teachers are remarkably tuned in to students' hopes and desires and are searching for ways to enable their entire profession to become more effective in relating with students. They believe that students want to and should be involved in their own governance, they sense the need for new models for education, and they are concerned about shortening the interval between sensitized teacher perception and performance. They feel they must change soon before more of their students turn elsewhere.

<u>And so what conclusions did we reach?</u>

One cannot easily forget the matter-of-fact observation of one student that, "By the time you guys in the establishment reach a generalization about a problem and organize the machinery to solve it, the problem has changed and the machinery is obsolete." The ever-bigger, ever-faster jets screeching over the horizon toward our outmoded airports substantiate the validity of our young cynics' conclusions as do the many other incongruities in a world which he refuses to take for granted. Whereas we looked for solutions he looks for accommodations, for he knows, with Shakespeare, that this too will pass. "It's now," he says.

And so we should recognize that the conclusions we may reach about changing expectations of students should be accepted as tentative generalizations leading to implementations which must be characterized by relevance, viability, flexibility, and acceptability. They also have to work.

Rising expectations on the part of students
is a part of the tempo of the times.

The rising expectations of all peoples worldwide regarding their own governance has not gone unnoticed by students. They have seen adults organize and pursue goals via active and aggressive campaigns. Indeed they have had a firsthand lesson in this technique from their teachers so it should not be surprising that students practice what has been preached and demonstrated to them. It may well be that we are reaping the fruits of the seeds we have sown for our students do indeed seem to have translated our words about democracy into deeds and action. Aspirations are changing more for the young than for the old and more for the black than the white members of society, and both of these conditions seem to be accompanied by a desire and need to demonstrate one's newly derived "place in the sun."

High school students are asking for greater participation in the operation and management of institutions affecting their lives and this should be welcomed. They are asking to be allowed to participate meaningfully in the functioning social order and if we accept responsibility for teaching citizenship it would seem that the most functional way would be to define with students real roles they can fill and real contributions they can make. In addition, as students and adults find more democracy in other sectors of society they would increasingly expect the school to allow them to share in decision making. However, the basic authoritarian character of most schools causes this to be regarded as a direct confrontation or challenge.

Changing expectations of students are not exclusively a matter of race.

High school students, regardless of race or economic status, are asking for greater participation in their school and in their community. The matter of race does enter (as witness the demands for courses in Black History, etc.) in the sense that members of the black community are reaching a new level of dignity and self-image. They want these facts to be recognized within the

school curriculum and they desire more school personnel of their own extraction with whom they can identify. The range of interests and subjects in which students wish to become involved does extend beyond the race issue which is, nonetheless, in the forefront in many schools at the present time.

> While student unrest is caused by conditions unique to each locality and situation there is a pervasive thread of commonality.

The fact that students were not involved in the decision to make up some of the time lost as a consequence of the teachers' strike in New York City, led some students to agitate in behalf of a student strike to indicate their displeasure at having been excluded from the decision-making process. Similarly strictly unique conditions have precipitated intensified unrest in other localities. However, an analysis of the national character of student unrest would seem to suggest that the lack of a machinery enabling students to be heard in a demonstrative fashion is a condition common to many instances of protest.

Another common aspect appears to be the fact that schools are frequently the recipient of action precipitated by aggravations rising elsewhere in the community. While the school cannot correct segregated housing or the lack of recreation facilities, it is the recipient of activist behavior such aggravation produces. To object to the external nature of the causation is meaningless; schools must cope with the action brought to their doorstep.

> Outside organizations to a limited degree are encouraging student activism.

Frustration in seeking redress of real or fancied grievances causes students to look outside the system for assistance. When the establishment's machinery is not made available to them to help them in formulating objectives and devising goal-achieving strategies, they become responsive to exploitation

by outside organizations eager to further their own interest via student frustration and protest. Intensification of the situation usually results inasmuch as the outside influences are frequently extremist in nature and anxious to assist students in formulating demands which realistically cannot possibly be met and thus the confrontation accelerates and positions polarize. However, student reaction at the regional meetings and reports from formal opinion polls lead to the conclusion that the influence of outside agitators and the presence of loosely organized extremists groups account for a negligible percentage of overt student protests and strikes.

Student unrest frequently is a by-product
of rigidity of the educational establishment.

Many communities, particularly urban communities, and school districts have been rapidly changing in recent years but all too often their schools have continued to do business as usual. Neighborhoods change from white to predominately black, white neighborhoods change from high income to low-middle income, suburbs lose their homogenity as diverse racial and ethnic groups move in and with rare exceptions the schools continue to operate as though their clientele were unchanged. In many instances the recently-arrived, minority group students are neither realistically nor sensitively perceived; it is as though they are not even there!

In a larger sense, the rapidly accelerating change-rate in other sectors of our society and economy is not matched by a similar change-rate in the substantive and procedural attributes of education. In both instances the schools are out of phase and lack relevance; they no longer serve the needs of their students or their communities. Accordingly, an increasing number of respected educational leaders are concluding that this factor alone will require substantial and rapid change in the way schools operate.

Student expectations concerning their own governance basically are rooted in altruism and integrity.

Student unrest can become student activism and student power if the honest desire of the great majority of students to improve their lot and that of their fellow man is met with tokenism, lip-service, and appeasement. Students, by and large, sincerely believe they can make a real contribution to society (Margaret Mead has said that for the first time in history students know more than their elders), they do want to contribute to the betterment of their school and neighborhood, they don't want to cop out, and the weakness reflected by appeasement often changes their desire for participation into a demand for control. Students differ widely with respect to the degree to which they expect change will be made and the rate at which it will take place, but they are unanimous in their expectation that improvement will have to take place.

Rising expectations should be encouraged on the part of all students.

The larger problem underlying the visible manifestation of student participation is represented by the sizeable numbers of students who are not rebelling, who are not participating. The real problem confronting education is represented by the passivist, the student who has given up before junior high school. He knows that passing grades, fast classes, extracurricular pursuits, attention from the guidance counselor, and further schooling after high school are not reasonable expectations for him! If he doesn't drop out, he stays in, but tunes out. He, and his numbers are not small, is the real problem, for his expectations are diminishing, not rising.

Student activism is comprised of students of diverse motivation, thereby necessitating differentiated responses.

Student unrest has many causes and many constituents; so too must the causes be sorted out and accorded suitable reaction. Student activists must be recognized as including the altruist, the radical, the conservative, the destructivist, the sincere student with a real grievance, the outside agitator, and the omnipresent "just plain hell raiser." For some students it's the "in thing" to do and for others protest is in behalf of a real cause. Any protest can include supporters of varied identities or may be composed solely of one element comprising the overall student body. Recognition of the need for this kind of analysis can increase the likelihood that the response made will be characterized by appropriateness.

Student activism will increase and assume a variety of forms.

Although youthful rebels are characterized by the short-sighted nature of their goals and tactics, the phenomenon of student's rising expectations will not diminish. Contrarily, we may expect it to spread and very likely increase in scope and intensity. Students with their lack of responsibility, their idealism, and their energy will undoubtedly move into any area or arena which strikes their fancy or their ideals. Their leadership role is perhaps already attested to by the possibility that student activism and the recently intensified adult demand for participative democracy may be more than sheer coincidence.

The perspective of history will cast student activism in a more significant light than it receives today.

In the future, historians and other social scientists may well regard the late 1960's and early 70's as a period when intensified student activism preceded and then precipitated sweeping changes in educational practice, political leadership, and economic custom. The numbers of students under twenty-five years of age, the effectiveness of their as yet uncoordinated

newly-found power, and the direction of their interests conceivably can hasten the implementation of needed educational innovations, affect the nature of the ongoing redefinition of governmental processes, and influence markedly the nature of the political and economic priorities set by the nation's decision makers.

American democracy is always redefining and renewing itself and the more visible manifestations are occurring in our colleges and high schools. Renewal and redefinition have been democracy's constant companion since the Declaration of Independence. Currently we are engaged in a very dramatic accommodation to change. The rate at which renewal and redefinition are expected to take place and the role of young people in the process are the factors that lend intensified drama and significance to the happening.

What recommendations have we made?

The implications of the rising expectations of high school students are comprehensive and far reaching. While the impact on education alone is not yet fully understood, it is necessary to specify some recommendations for working with students in this time of change during which new relationships are evolving. The proposals which follow are suggested for consideration with reference to secondary schools only:

1. The prescription of specific guidelines for statewide application is neither feasible nor recommended.

Despite the presence of elements common to most instances of overt student protest, the uniqueness of each situation and the fact of local differences preclude the formulation of a single statewide answer, guideline, or procedure. Guidelines relative to student participation should be general, should be evolved in partnership with the chief factions which the schools serve, and should reflect local dynamics and relationships. Parents, teachers, students, Board members, and administrators, all with a sensitivity to local conditions,

should develop their own local statement of philosophy and procedures to be used in defining the responsibility of each group in the operation of the educational institution. Provision should be made for future modification and supplementation but it is absolutely essential that all constitutents be involved in developing a definition of the limits within which local participative management will function. Equally essential is the fact that all must know in advance the consequences for attempts to exceed the mutually defined limits. Collaborative organization cannot work without the existence of mutually designed and mutually accepted rules.

2. Educational leaders must take the initiative in convincing their profession and their community that student activism is potentially a constructive force compatible with basic democratic principles.

In recent months, as student activism has spread and intensified, public and political opinion have reflected a belief that student participation in institutional governance is a prelude to anarchy and chaos. By word and deed educational institutions need to show that responsible citizenship can best be taught by making students responsible for their own conduct and by extending their range of responsibility. In the absence of this leadership, repressive and damaging measures may be enacted which may well cause intensification of the problem.

3. Superintendents of schools should carefully analyze or update their analysis of their community.

Failure to appreciate the nature of the community has been a key factor in preventing many schools from recognizing the nature of their tasks. It is a rare community that has not changed appreciably in the last five years and frequently it is the non-political community leaders who are the last to note the change.

4. In developing philosophy and procedures for greater constituent involvement, school officials should include representation of forces not recognized nor present in the community previously.

Frequently the influx of a new ethnic or minority group into an established community is not recognized by the existing organizational patterns or power structure which came into being prior to the arrival of the new group. Consequently, the new arrivals are made to feel voiceless and powerless as indeed they are if they are not officially recognized.

5. The visibility of minority group participation should be observable to all.

Frequently the increased contributions of minority groups and students to the overall operation and the decision-making process are unknown to their community. Attention may well have to be focused on the services, contributions, and influence of minority group leaders especially if the fact of their status is relatively new.

6. New communication channels must be created and existing channels must be made more effective operationally.

Existing communication channels may not be utilized or listened to by constitutents who feel the establishment has not been responsive to their needs. For example, those who serve either as student or adult de facto and status leaders are frequently quite different persons. Whereas status leaders and their constitutents might be communicated with via the student council, the old time community power structure, and the daily press, these instrumentalities may well be deliberately ignored by the de facto leaders and their followers. Also, the spokesman of a protesting student group is not necessarily their leader and this fact must be recognized in dealing with unrest.

7. Education's goals and purposes for all whom it serves must be cooperatively defined and achieved.

Unrest at the higher education level in some cases reportedly has been caused partly because of the lack of a "shared sense of purpose." The purposes of the school, the way in which it intends to meet those purposes, and the success achieved must periodically be reviewed and reported. Involvement of

those affected is very important in this regard also. Recognition of differences is requisite as is appropriateness of procedures and content.

8. Significance, relevance, and integrity must be brought to the curriculum in greater measure.

Much educational practice is rooted in the past and content is in large measure remote to the problems besetting the nation. Methodology often seems alien to the 20th century. McLuhan has commented on the "riches of the television feast and the poverty of the school experience." Hypocrisy and shallowness have no place in a curriculum for youth confronted with supersonic travel; air, water, and values pollution; drug abuse; world-wide television; war; poverty and affluence; discrimination and prejudice. Much of yesterday's curriculum was predicated on the need to protect youth so as to get them ready to deal with the world. Today, combinations of circumstances have imposed reality upon our children with the result that education must now use reality as its lesson.

9. Redeployment of personnel and restructuring of organization and procedures must recognize increased peer group influence.

Increasingly, students are taking their direction from other students. Minority group members, likewise, get their direction and standards from other members of their minority group. Therefore, organizational viability requires institutionalization of opportunities for leadership by peer group personnel.

10. A deliberately planned program should be provided to sensitize all staff personnel to the perspective of others.

Whether one refers to the process as sensitivity training, empathy, or an enhanced sympathetic introspection, the basic need is to develop on the part of the teacher, the administrator, cafeteria worker, secretary, and bus driver, a concern for and sensitivity to the needs, feelings, and well-being of others. Agreements re procedures, goals, and purposes established in good faith will not become operational throughout the system unless the requisite skills and

attitudes are developed by means of a deliberately planned staff development plan.

11. Protest should be anticipated and tactics and strategy for dealing with it should be available.

The arrival of a grievance or protest should not be cause for pushing the panic button. While improvisation to meet unique changing conditions is necessary, basic positions should be defined in advance and efforts to maintain constant dialogue must be unceasing. Minor articulation of a grievance is a healthy first step toward resolution of the precipitating condition. A boycott or some other form of protest may well be an acceptable, non-threatening, play for attention which, if ignored, may lead to more serious consequences. In addition to developing a strategy for relating to student activism, tactical procedures should be outlined for dealing with minor flashes of unrest. In every case, the intent to negotiate, the refusal to abdicate, and the essentiality of maintaining a constant dialogue within the framework of previously established ground rules should be insisted upon.

12. Professional organizations should join forces to promote constructive utilization of the increased student drive for greater participation.

Teachers', administrators', and Board of Education organizations should pursue campaigns among their respective memberships to encourage the possibility that student activism may quickly become a potent force for improvement of education. Each group could sponsor in-service opportunities for its clientele as well as serve as repositories for materials about programs which in operation provide exemplary definitions of the role of students in their own governance. Hopefully, cooperative action on the part of the professional organizations could serve as an example to encourage students to pursue cooperation as a means of achieving goals.

13. The Education Department offers to assist local school officials in planning changes in programs and procedures to meet growing student activism.

The Education Department is not equipped to provide supervisory or monitoring services which might be sought in time of major confrontation, but several offices within the Department are able to help local school officials in planning for positive adjustment to the heightened aspirations of youth. The Office of Intercultural Relations is providing this type of service to several communities at the present time and will continue to do so--within the limits of available staff. The Curriculum Division is helping schools to adapt to demands in that area. The School Administrators Leadership Training Unit (SALT), which works out of the Office of Secondary School Supervision, is planning administrators' meetings on this subject. The Division of Pupil Personnel Services has several staff members who are prepared to consult on this subject and is in the process of employing three 1969 college graduates who have experience related to this area and who will serve as resource persons. We may be offering more than we can deliver by suggesting that schools call on the Department for advice and assistance, but our function is one of service, and we will do so within the limits of our capabilities.

While considerable criticism has been directed at students because they appear to be protesting against rather than protesting for something, this seeming lack of a specified program is not altogether a negative condition. Students apparently have not been brainwashed into acceptance of a new ideology or dogma. They are looking for improvement upon conditions as they currently obtain and thus the opportunity exists for adults to work positively and constructively with students in defining and reaching for finer conditions. Students are not confronting adults with a take-it-or-leave-it program; they are open to, indeed are seeking to negotiate with adults. Some educators would define such a condition as "the arrival of the teaching moment."

Additionally, it has been said that students in protesting are not demonstrating responsible behavior and will not accept responsibility for their conduct. If such is the case, several observations arise, including the possibility that the adults have been more successful in teaching students the meaning of protest and privilege than they have in teaching the concommitance of responsibility. Or perhaps to observe that the apple does not fall too far from the tree is not completely irrelevant.

Perhaps the major confrontation occurring today is the fact that our youth are seeking to involve us in evolution aimed at redefining democracy in a way which is consonant with our future as well as our heritage. We can neither dictate answers to youth nor abdicate our responsibility to them if we are to be true to the canons of our profession. We have no choice save to teach.